

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF NORTH CAROLINA**

COMMON CAUSE, *et al.*,)
Plaintiffs,)
v.)
ROBERT A. RUCHO, in his official) CIVIL ACTION
capacity as Chairman of the North) No. 1:16-CV-1026-WO-JEP
Carolina Senate Redistricting)
Committee for the 2016 Extra Session)
and Co-Chairman of the Joint Select)
Committee on Congressional)
Redistricting, *et al.*,)
Defendants.)

League of Women Voters of North)
Carolina, *et al.*,)
Plaintiffs,)
v.) CIVIL ACTION
Robert A. Rucho, in his official capacity) No. 1:16-Cv-1164-WO-JEP
as Chairman of the North Carolina)
Senate Redistricting Committee for the)
2016 Extra Session and Co-Chairman of)
the 2016 Joint Select Committee on)
Congressional Redistricting, *et al.*,)
Defendants.)

**LEGISLATIVE DEFENDANTS' REPLY IN SUPPORT OF MOTION TO STAY
AUGUST 27, 2018 ORDER**

Yesterday, the Court entered an Order declining to enjoin the use of the 2016 Congressional Redistricting Plan (“2016 Plan”) in the November 6, 2018 general election. (D.E. 150).¹ In the same Order, the Court ordered all Plaintiffs and State Defendants to file a response to Legislative Defendants’ Motion to Stay (D.E. 146) the Court’s August 27, 2018 Order (D.E. 142) prohibiting the use 2016 Plan after the November 6, 2018 general election. In giving this directive, the Court asked the Plaintiffs and State Defendants to “focus on whether Legislative Defendants will suffer irreparable harm from our order to not allow the use of the unconstitutional 2016 Plan beyond the November 6, 2018, general election.” (D.E. 150, p. 3).

Before the Court entered its Order yesterday, the Common Cause Plaintiffs filed a response to Legislative Defendant’s Motion to Stay stating their belief that permitting the Supreme Court an opportunity to “speedily” review this Court’s judgment “before a remedy is implemented” would be the “most prudent course.” (D.E. 149, p. 2). Although Legislative Defendants disagree with the Common Cause Plaintiffs’ assertion that this Court’s judgment should be affirmed, they agree that allowing the Supreme Court an opportunity to review this Court’s decision before any remedy is implemented is indeed the “most prudent course.” Earlier today, the League of Women Voters Plaintiffs filed a response to the Court’s Order yesterday requesting that the Court “consider commencing remedial plan action in May of 2019” or, alternatively, enter a stay on two conditions proposed by the Common Cause Plaintiffs. (D.E. 151, pp. 2-3).

¹ All docket entries cited correspond with the docket entries in Case No. 1:16-cv-1026.

Legislative Defendants strongly disagree with the contentions by Plaintiffs that they seek to delay the ultimate resolution of this matter. Legislative Defendants seek only to ensure that the Supreme Court can review this case before any remedial proceedings begin. Accordingly, Legislative Defendants do not oppose Plaintiffs' proposal to condition entry of a stay pending the completion of Supreme Court review of the August 27, 2018 Order on the following: (1) that Legislative Defendants will file their Jurisdictional Statement with the Supreme Court by October 1, and (2) that Legislative Defendants will seek no requests for extension of time while their appeal is pending before the Supreme Court.

Accordingly, Legislative Defendants request that this Court stay its Order of August 27, 2018 pending Supreme Court review.

Respectfully submitted this 5th day of September, 2018.

OGLETREE, DEAKINS, NASH
SMOAK & STEWART, P.C.

/s/ Phillip J. Strach
Phillip J. Strach
N.C. State Bar No. 29456
Michael D. McKnight
N.C. State Bar No. 36932
phil.strach@ogletreedeakins.com
michael.mcknight@ogletreedeakins.com
4208 Six Forks Road, Suite 1100
Raleigh, North Carolina 27609
Telephone: (919) 787-9700
Facsimile: (919) 783-9412
Counsel for Legislative Defendants

CERTIFICATE OF COMPLIANCE WITH WORD LIMITATION

I hereby certify that the total word count for the body of the foregoing reply including headings and footnotes is 417 words.

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I, Phillip J. Strach, hereby certify that I have this day electronically filed the foregoing with the Clerk of Court using the CM/ECF system which will provide electronic notification of the same to the following:

Edwin M. Speas, Jr.
Carolina P. Mackie
Poyner Spruill LLP
P.O. Box 1801 (27602-1801)
301 Fayetteville St., Suite 1900
Raleigh, NC 27601
espeas@poynerspruill.com
cmackie@poymerspruill.com
Attorneys for Plaintiffs

Emmet J. Bondurant
Jason J. Carter
Benjamin W. Thorpe
Bondurant, Mixson & Elmore, LLP
1201 W. Peachtree Street, NW, Suite 3900
Atlanta, Georgia 30309
bondurant@bmelaw.com
carter@bmelaw.com
bthorpe@bmelaw.com
Attorneys for Plaintiffs

Gregory L. Diskant
Susan Millenky
Patterson Belknap Webb & Tyler LLP
1133 Avenue of the Americas
New York, New York 10036
gldiskant@pbwt.com
smullenky@pbwt.com
Attorneys for Plaintiffs

Alexander McC. Peters
Senior Deputy Attorney General
apeters@ncdoj.gov
N.C. Department of Justice
P.O. Box 629
Raleigh, NC 27602
Attorneys for State Defendants

Allison Riggs
SOUTHERN COALITION FOR SOCIAL
JUSTICE
1415 W. HWY. 54, STE. 101
DURHAM, NC 27707
Email: emily@southerncoalition.org
Email: anita@southerncoalition.org
*Attorneys for League of Women Voters of
North Carolina Plaintiffs*

Danielle M. Lang
CAMPAIGN LEGAL CENTER
1411 K STREET NW
SUITE 1400
WASHINGTON, DC 20005
202-736-2200
Fax: 202-736-2222
Email: dlang@campaignlegalcenter.org
*Attorneys for League of Women Voters of
North Carolina Plaintiffs*

Annabelle E. Harless
Ruth M. Greenwood
CAMPAIGN LEGAL CENTER
73 W. MONROE ST., STE. 322
CHICAGO, IL 60603
312-561-5508
Fax: 202-736-2222
Email: aharless@campaignlegalcenter.org
*Attorneys for League of Women Voters of
North Carolina Plaintiffs*

Nicholas O. Stephanopoulos
UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO LAW
SCHOOL
1111 E 60TH STREET
CHICAGO, IL 60637
773-702-4226
Email: nsteph@uchicago.edu
*Attorneys for League of Women Voters of
North Carolina Plaintiffs*

This the 5th day of September, 2018.

OGLETREE, DEAKINS, NASH
SMOAK & STEWART, P.C.

/s/ Phillip J. Strach

35404701.1